DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 182 644 CG 014 142

AUTHOR Foss, Joyce E.
TITLE Power Modes in Marital Interaction.
INSTITUTION New Hampshire Univ., Durham.; Sangamon State Univ., Springfield, Ill.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Mental Health (DHEW), Rockville, Md.
PUB DATE Aug 79
GRANT NIMH-MH-15221
NOTE 39p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Council on Family Relations (Boston, MA, August 14-18, 1979); Not available in paper copy due to marginal legibility

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Behavior Patterns; *Communication (Thought Transfer); Interaction Process Analysis; *Interpersonal Relationship; Marital Instability; *Marriage; *Power Structure; *Sex Differences; *Spouses

ABSTRACT

Power modes in marital interactions were investigated in a laboratory observation study at the University of New Hampshire in 1975. Married couples (N=78) were the subjects in this study, whose focus was on the power modes (types of power assertion) used by the partners, shifting attention from the much-considered distribution of power in marriage to the question of how husbands and wives go about attempting to influence one another. A new system for coding marital interaction, the Marital Power Assertion Coding System (MPACS) was developed for this purpose, containing three broad divisions each with several sub-categories: (1) unqualified, direct power modes; (2) qualified, indirect power modes; and (3) bilateral power modes. Differences between the two groups in types of power assertions used were found to be generally consistent with findings in previous research on sex differences in communication as well as research efforts conducted after 1975. (Author/HLM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED182644

HARD COPY NOT AVAILABLE

POWER MODES IN MARITAL INTERACTION*

Joyce E. Foss
Sangamon State University

ABSTRACT

This paper is the first report on a new laboratory observation study of marital interaction, carried out at the University of New Hampshire in 1975. The study is based on 78 married couples, 16 of whom were in marital counseling at the time of the research, and who participated in the Olson-Ryder Inventory of Marital Interaction task.

The conceptual focus of this paper is on the power modes, or types of power assertion, used by the partners. The emphasis is on shifting attention from the much-considered distribution of power in marriage, to the question of how husbands and wives go about attempting to influence one another.

A new system for coding marital interaction, the Marital Power Assertion Coding System (MPACS) was developed for this purpose. The system contains three broad divisions, each with several sub-categories: (1) unqualified, direct power modes, (2) qualified, indirect power modes, and (3) bilateral power modes. The paper introduces and examines the concept of power modes, and describes and presents basic findings from this new classification system. In particular, the power modes of wives and husbands are considered, and differences between the two groups in types of power assertions used are found to be generally consistent with findings in previous research on sex differences in communication.

*Paper prepared for presentation at the National Council on Family Relations meetings, August, 1979, Boston. This paper was supported in part by NIMH grant number MH-15221 for training in research on family and deviance, by the University of New Hampshire, and by Sangamon State University.

I would like to express my appreciation to Murray A. Straus, Dennis C. Foss, and Martha D. Huggins for comments and suggestions on many of the ideas contained in this paper. Special thanks to Robert Randall for his assistance in coding and in refining and improving the MPACS.

CG 014142

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Joyce E. Foss

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

The extensive literature of recent decades on power relations in families has been filled with controversy over concepts, methodology, and theory (for recent analyses, see Olson, 1969; Olson and Cromwell, 1975; Olson and Rabunsky, 1972; Safilios-Rothschild, 1970; Sprey, 1972; Turk, 1974; 1975; Turk and Bell, 1972). The central issue addressed in the research reported here is the almost exclusive concern of the existing literature with the distribution of power, or the relative amounts of power of family members.

Several authors have noted the comparative lack of theoretical attention to such aspects of power as process, negotiation, bargaining, and levels of governance (Broderick, 1975; Olson and Cromwell, 1975; Sprey, 1972). In research also, these more dynamic aspects of power have been neglected. In an ongoing analysis of existing marital power measures, Foss and Straus are finding that nearly all measures deal with the power distribution, and very few with how wives and husbands go about influencing each other.

The resource theory of power, a variant of exchange theory (Cromwell and Olson, 1975:24; Smith, 1970), has dominated the study of power in marriage. Basically, this model suggests that the partner with the greater personal resources relative to the other will have a greater influence on marital decision-making (Blood and Wolfe, 1960:11-12). The notion of resources has also figured prominently in models of power developed outside the

family arena - as in Rogers' (1974) typology of resources as bases of power, or Buckley's and Burns' (1975) work on meta-power.

In general, adherents of a resource model have paid little attention to processual aspects of power. Instead, they have centered their energies on identifying and explaining the distribution of power. This is an important issues, and a great deal still needs to be done in this area (see Bahr, 1972; Olson and Cromwell, 1975; Safilios-Rothschild, 1970; Turk and Bell, 1972). Still, it is only one issue. Preoccupation with the "who has more power" question blinds us to other issues - like the techniques by which marital partners attempt to exercise power.

Models and measures of "powering" in marriage have the potential of making at least three basic contributions. First, asking <u>how</u> decisions or resolutions are reached, rather than <u>who wins</u>, encourages a shift away from an exclusively win/lose view of marital power (Sprey, 1972). Second, the question "who wins" tends to discourage moving beyond the individual level of analysis, especially in studying dyadic relationships like marriage. In contrast, examining power <u>modes</u> may encourage less individualistic analysis.

Third, serious attention to power modes may make for more dynamic, processual models of power. Structure may be defined as a pattern characterisitc of a relationship at a given point in time. If the power distribution is an aspect of structure, then confining ourselves to this dimension means confining

ourselves to a fairly static aspect of power. Types of power assertion can also develop characteristic patterns in marriages. They can then be treated as an aspect of power which is also static. power modes seem more likely than the power distribution to fit into the eventual study of process and dynamics. At the very least, the study of power modes is crucial to understanding how the power distribution changes over time.

The purposes of this paper are: (1) to introduce the concept of power modes; (2) to present a new system for coding marital interaction, the Marital Power Assertion Coding System (MPACS); and (3) to present basic descriptive findings for the system, with attention to husbands' and wives' use of power modes. These findings are based on a study of 78 married couples who participated in the Inventory of Marital Interaction task.

POWER MODES AND OTHER POWER CONCEPTS

There has been so much debate over the term, that it is necessary to grapple with the definition of "power" at the outset of any research in this area. Turk has argued that the confusion is so great as to warrant eliminating the concept altogether (1975). However, Olson and Cromwell take the less drastic stand that power is a multi-dimensional concept, and the term "should be employed as a generic construct, consisting of several different, but related, concepts and dimensions" (1975:5). In line with the latter position, power is defined here as the set of variables involved in the alteration or maintenance of group outcomes by group members.

The term "group outcomes" is very important. First, it

suggests that power is relative to specific social systems (Rogers, 1974). If power is viewed in this way, then it cannot be viewed as merely a "...fixed or stable individual disposition. Rather it is a social phenomenon susceptible to the ebb and flow of the social life in which it is embedded" (Rogers, 1974:1432).

The second advantage of the "group outcomes" phrase lies in its encouragement of thhking beyond the individual level. Family researchers have focused mainly on dyads, and so have usually defined power as the ability to alter the other's behavior. The present definition is more general and directs attention to the study of larger units.

Amid all the furor over the concept of power, an especially prominent issue has been whether power refers to an ability or potential to influence, or to actual attempts to influence outcomes, or only to successful attempts to influence them. The present definition subsumes all three and implies that specific dimensions of power ought to be given distinct terms. Thus, for example, successful acts of control represent "achieved power."

The focus in this research is attempts to influence a group. These are termed power assertions, and defined as attempts to alter or maintain group outcomes by group members. Power modes themselves are the specific types of acts carried out as power assertions, or, simply, types of power assertion.

The term "power modes" is new to the study of husband-wife power relations, though there is some precedent for the concept.

Sprey has repeatedly called for the study of process, strategy, bargaining, and "powering" (1972:236). Burr suggests that it is "important to distinguish between the distribution of power and the different methods that are used in controlling. For example, attempts to control can be made verbally or non-verbally, overtly or covertly, and with physical threats or without them" (1973:189). Another source for the concept is the distinction by Foss and Straus (1975) between measures of power distribution and measures of "powering techniques."

The primary goal of this research was to develop a system of coding power modes in marital interaction. A second goal was to explore relationships between other dimensions of power - like personal resources, authority, and self-reported power - and power modes. The results of that exploration must be reserved for another place. The central question here is how power modes may be measured. Before moving to that, the research procedures will be discussed.

PROCEDURES

The research is a combined self-report and laboratory observation study of 78 married couples, carried out at the University of New Hampshire during the summer of 1975.

The Sample

Couples from the southeast/seacoast area of New Hampshire were chosen through three selection procedures. One approach involved randomly selecting potential subjects from the Durham town voting lists. One hundred twenty potential research couples

met the criteria that they be married and living together in the town at the time of the research. The response rate was 45 percent, or 54 of the 120 eligible couples. Another procedure (actually the first one) yielded an additional eight couples from the neighboring small city of Dover.[1]

Finally, 16 of the couples were referred to the project by private marriage counselors and other agencies providing marriage counseling services in the area. Whether and on what basis the agency couples were selected for referral was left to the discretion of the counselors.

Given the response rate for the non-counseling sample, and the selectivity in counselor referrals, there are serious limits to generalization of the findings to any clearly specifiable population. Despite this, the combined sample has the advantage of being moderately large in comparison to those in previous observational studies of families. In addition, the sample includes a broad enough range of middle and working class participants to provide a fertile testing ground for ideas about marital interaction and power relations.

Despite the fairly broad range of couples included in the sample, overall it is heavily middle class and professional. Were it not for the inclusion of the clinical couples, it would be even more skewed in this direction. The couples in counseling were on the average about 10 years younger, were more likely to

[1]Additional information on procedures and sample characteristics may be found in Poss (1978:9-25).

have a child under 6 or no children, reported lower incomes and occupational and educational levels, and were more likely to include a wife who worked outside the home.[1]

The Session

The data-gathering procedures generally required about two hours. Spouses first completed separate but identical background questionnaires. They then participated in the Inventory of Marital Conflicts task (IMC), developed at the University of Minnesota (Olson and Ryder, 1970). Each spouse reads 18 brief descriptions of couples having marital conflicts, and makes judgments about each case. In 12 of these stories, two different perspectives on the situation are presented - the husband's and the wife's. For the other 6 items, both spouses read exactly the same stories. This design sets the stage for disagreement

[1] For the sample as a whole, roughly 70 percent were Protestant, 20 percent Catholic, and the rest reported other affiliations or no religious preference. The mean number of children was 2.31. About 14 percent had no children, 19 percent had at least one child under six, and 67 percent had at least one child but none under six years old.

About one-third of the husbands had at least some graduate education, and another 30 percent were college graduates. About 40 percent of the women had some college work, 30 percent were college graduates, and 10 percent had done some graduate work. Only two men and two women had not completed high school. These data reflect the location of the research in and around a "university town."

About 40 percent of the women worked outside the home full time, and 25 percent part time. Among these women, 2 percent were major professionals, 27 percent were in middle-level professional occupations, 13 percent were minor professionals, 36 percent clerical/sales, and 22 percent blue collar workers. For the men, 37 percent were major professionals, 15 percent middle-level, and 22 percent minor professionals. Eleven percent were clerical/sales workers, and 14 percent did blue collar work.

Eleven percent of the couples had total family incomes under $10,000, 45 percent from $10,000 to under $20,000, and 43 percent earned $20,000 or more. The average age of the women was 40, and of the men 41.8 years.

on 12 of the items and does not induce disagreement on the other six. For a sample conflict-inducing vignette, see Figure 1.

When each spouse had read the vignettes and completed individual answer forms, they came together to discuss each case, resolve disagreements, and complete a joint answer form. The discussion was videotaped and tape recorded. Couples were asked to complete the task in 30 minutes, although they were allowed to continue if necessary. After the discussion, each partner filled out the IMC Post Discussion Form concerning their reactions to the task, as well as the Blood and Wolfe Decision Power Index. Finally, the session administrator debriefed the couple.

The IMC Task

As a stimulus for marital interaction in the laboratory, the IMC has several important features. First, by inducing disagreement, the task negates the tendency for family members to present a united, mutually supportive front to observers. Second, the task is highly involving. In this study, while participants were told in advance they would receive different perspectives on the vignettes, they forgot this in the course of completing the task. Third, the vignettes have an unusual degree of realism. They describe couples having common marital difficulties - even the classic taking-out-the-garbage and football-Sunday conflicts are included. Providing different perspectives on the same situation adds another element of realism, since couples actually having their own disagreement would un-

Husband's Version

"Linda and Steve plan to take a weekend trip by car. While Linda is driving Steve to work on Friday morning, Steve hears a "pinging" noise and realizes that the spark plugs should be changed along with other minor adjustments. Since they plan to leave Friday evening and Steve has to work, he has to ask his wife to take the car to the garage. Linda complains about the other preparations she says she has to make for them and their two children but says she will have time to take the car to the garage, and agrees to do so. Later on the trip, Steve hears the "pinging" noise and realizes the spark plugs have not been changed. It turns out that Linda took the car to the garage but did not bother to mention the spark plugs. Linda says that if Steve doesn't like the way she does things, he can do them himself. Steve points out that he was unable to take the car to the garage, and that when she agrees to do something she should do it."

a. Who is primarily responsible for the problem? (husband/wife)
b. Should Linda thoroughly carry out her responsibilities once she has accepted them? (yes/no)

Wife's Version

"Linda and Steve plan to take a weekend trip by car. While Linda is driving Steve to work on Friday morning, Steve decides that the spark plugs need changing and that other minor adjustments should be made. He tells his wife to get the work done in time for them to leave that evening. Linda also has all the other preparations to manage for them and their two children but she manages to get the car to the garage and asks for a tuneup. On the trip, Steve hears a "pinging" noise, discovers that the spark plugs are the ones he had been using, and blames his wife for the spark plugs not being changed. Linda feels that if he is going to be so picky about how things are going to be done, he should assume some responsibility for doing them himself. Steve tells her he was too busy."

a. Who is primarily responsible for the problem? (husband/wife)
b. Is Steven being unreasonable in blaming his wife for the work not getting done? (yes/no)

Joint Form

a. Who is primarily responsible for the problem? (husband/wife)
b. Should Linda thoroughly carry out her responsibilities...
or
Is Steve being unreasonable in blaming his wife...

Figure 1. Sample Conflict-inducing Vignette, IMC.

doubtedly bring differing perspectives to the confrontation.

Coding Procedures

Interactions from only the 12 conflict-inducing vignettes were coded. The 6 non-conflict cases seemed unlikely to provide rich material with respect to the power modes system.

Each couple's IMC discussion had been taped, and the coding was done on the transcript while listening to the tapes. Two of the tapes were of such poor quality that they could not be coded, so the sample size for the power modes data is 76 - 62 non-counseling and 14 counseling couples.[1]

DEVELOPING A MEASURE OF POWER MODES

While there have been a number of systems developed for coding marital interaction, none has been specifically designed to focus on types of power assertions made by intimates. One possibility for the present study would have been to use an existing system and concentrate analysis on categories which seem relevant to power modes. The system designed by Olson and Ryder for use with the IMC task might have been chosen, for

[1] Two-thirds of the transcripts were coded by the investigator and one-third by an M.A. student in sociology. For the first few cases coded by the assistant, the transcripts were double-coded. Then, we went over the codings together as a training exercise, and as time went on to ensure that our uses of the categories were consistent.

While resources were not available to double-code all cases and run full reliability assessments, some steps were taken to minimize intercoder discrepancies and drift over time. Each coder reviewed the MPACS system before each session to ensure that infrequently used categories would be kept in mind. About every fifth transcript, a portion of the discussion was double-coded. Then both coders went over the section, resolved differences, reviewed categories, and discussed problems with particular items. In this way, a common understanding of the coding system was maintained.

example. The authors note that this is a "purely descriptive, non-theoretically based coding system," and suggest that "an investigator always has the option of selecting codes from the IPC system which seem most appropriate for use in a given research project" (1973:1).

Two characteristics of this particular system made it inappropriate for my purposes. First, a large number of the categories are designed to distinguish between interaction over the IMC task and other, more personalized statements - a distinction which is not of particular interest here. Second, the system appears to be procedural and format-oriented, rather than content-oriented. This characteristic means that it would be very difficult to extract categories which substantively represent types of power assertions.

A rare typology of power modes, based on responses to an open-ended question in a survey research, which might have been adapted for use in coding laboratory interaction, was developed by Safilios-Rothschild (1969). However, like another self-report measure, the Conflict Tactics Scales (Straus, 1974), this typology covers a broader range of techniques than is likely to occur in a laboratory setting. In addition, like the Olson-Ryder IPC coding system, the Safilios-Rothschild typology did not seem to have the kind of theoretical base necessary for my purposes. For example, a major division of the typology is between verbal and non-verbal techniques, a distinction not developed here. Thus, this typology, like existing interaction coding systems, was bypassed in favor of developing a system tailormade for

coding marital power assertions in the laboratory.

The Range of Behavior

The first step in developing a new system was to identify the range of behavior to be counted as power assertive. At one extreme, anything that anyone does can be viewed as a power assertion. Hawley has argued that "every social act is a power equation, and every social system is an organization of power" (1963:423). In the sense that every social act may be positively or negatively reinforcing of another's behavior, or as Turk puts it, "all the actions of every individual in the choice situation have some impact on the outcome" (1975:85), then indeed any behavior could be seen as a power assertion.

While this is intuitively reasonable, it does not seem viable for research purposes. In this view, power assertions are apparently equivalent to causal influences. Thus, any behavior which has a causal influence on the other is a power assertion.[1] If we adopt such a view, we need to find out whether a behavior did in fact have a causal influence (or was "effective" or "successful") before we could classify it as a power assertion. And, we should probably have to do this for each couple individually, for what is reinforcing in the context of one relationship may not be in another. Not only would such a task be truly enormous, but it also begs the question. It shifts attention

[1] If so, why not also include non-human causal influences as power assertions?

away from attempts to alter the outcomes of a group, which may or may not be effective, to successful power assertions ("achieved power"), which is an entirely different dimension.

Interactional Measures of the Power Distribution

In delineating the range of acts to be considered power assertions, some leads may be taken from interactional measures of the amount of power held by marital partners. Few existing measures of husband-wife power in any way classify modes of powering used by spouses (Foss and Straus, 1975). However, many observation systems which have been used to study the power distribution use a counting of instances of power assertive behavior to measure how much power a person has. How power assertions are defined in these researches is of help in establishing the parameters of power modes. Two basic approaches have been taken - one is "content-free" and the other "content-based."

Content-free Approaches. Content-free approaches disregard the content of the behavior, and focus on its existence or form. For example, Strodtbeck (1951; 1954) and Farina (1960) have used as a measure of power who talks the most, and who most often initiates discussion. Leighton et al. (1971) have used the number of interruptions and the number of simultaneous speeches. Farina (1960) also used the number of interruptions. Cromwell and Olson (1975) have criticized many of these measures as being essentially a-theoretical and conceptually unsophisticated. They also cover only a very limited range of behavior and do not suggest any way of classifying power modes.

Content-based Approaches. Several approaches are content-based in that the determination of whether an act represents power is based on its content. Two fairly narrow examples are Caputo's (1963) measure using the number of instrumental (task-oriented) acts which are directive, and the Riskin and Faunce (1970) measure of the number of "behave yourself requests" and "requests for commitment." Both of these have the disadvantage of including only the most directive and obvious strategies, and excluding more subtle tactics like attempts at persuasion.

Kerkel's (1963) somewhat broader measure is the total number of instrumental (rather than expressive) acts, using the Bales Interaction Process Analysis coding system (1950). In this system, instrumental acts include giving and requesting suggestions or directions, opinions, and information. While this measure has the advantage of offering a neat typology, it lacks content validity in that it includes behaviors which seem at best indirectly related to power assertions (as in asking for information) and excludes actions which seem clearly relevant (such as rejection, antagonism, and defending or asserting self, which are classified as expressive behaviors). Counting all instrumental acts as power-relevant and all expressive acts as non-power-related is inappropriate.

One additional approach classifies power acts a "any direction, instruction, suggestion, or request intended to control or modify the behavior of another member of the family" (Straus and Tallman, 1971:392). Cromwell et al. (1975) adopt the same criterion, and specify that any behavior which is not coded as a power act is

coded "sociable act" and these include "nondirective, non-goal-oriented, supportive, and climate setting types of statements (1975:156).

Using this criterion, Cromwell et al. (1975) found that in a discussion task 15 percent of a family's total activity was power activity, and in a more physical, game task (SIMFAM), 31 percent was power activity. While this measure of power acts is broader than many others, both the behaviors which are not included as power acts and the relatively low percentage of activity classified as power assertions, suggest that this measure also focuses on the most obvious power assertions and excludes more subtle ones. On the other hand, this measure is most consistent with the conception of power modes as attempts to modify group outcomes.

The approaches discussed thus far offered some criteria for classifying acts as power assertions, but did not suggest actual typologies or distinctions among codes. Actually, some of the best leads for developing a power modes typology came from the parent-child literature. As Foss and Straus (1975) point out, in parent-child measures of power the emphasis is not on the distribution of power, but on power modes - specifically, the types of power assertions which parents make in attempting to "get their children to do something."

Hoffman's Qualified and Unqualified Power Assertions

In looking at parental power modes, Hoffman (1963) makes an important distinction between qualified and unqualified power assertion techniques. Unqualified power assertions include

direct commands, threats, and deprivations as well as physical force, with no explanations or justifications offered by the parent. Qualified power assertions are influence techniques which are qualified by explanation and various types of persuasive appeals. This distinction became an important one in the coding system for husband-wife power assertions developed for this research.

In a later analysis, Hoffman (1970) offered a somewhat different model. He classified parental influence techniques into power assertive and non-power-assertive categories. Power assertive techniques included "physical punishment, deprivation of material objects or privileges, the direct application of force, or the threat of any of these...The parent seeks to control the child by capitalizing on his physical power or control over material resources" (1970:285). This category appears equivalent to unqualified power assertions in the first model.

Non-power-assertive techniques are divided into "love-withdrawal" and "induction." Love-withdrawal means "the parent simply gives direct but non-physical expression to his anger or disapproval of the child...Examples are ignoring the child, turning one's back to him, refusing to speak or listen to him, explicitly stating a dislike for the child, and isolating or threatening to leave him" (1970:285). Induction techniques are those in which the parent "gives explanations or reasons for requiring the child to change his behavior" (1970:286). Thus, induction in this model is equivalent to "qualified power assertion" in the first. While Hoffman seems to ultimately view per-

suasive appeals as non-power-assertive, I prefer the view that they are qualified power assertions. Power assertions were defined above as any attempt to alter group outcomes, and persuasive appeals clearly fit this definition, even though they aim at obtaining the change "voluntarily."

THE MARITAL POWER ASSERTION CODING SYSTEM (MPACS)

Two of the three major divisions of the coding system - unqualified and qualified power assertions - are broadly based on Hoffman's (1963) analysis. The third division - bilateral power assertions - is based on an assumption that an important part of power processes in marriages, as in other groups, is not only unilateral, win-oriented behavior, but also bargaining, negotiation, and trading of positions. Tables 1 and 2 list the MPACS divisions and specific codes, and give descriptive statistics on their use by the wives and husbands in this study.[1]

Unqualified Power Assertions

Earlier, power modes were defined as types of power assertion or attempts to alter group outcomes. Unqualified power assertions are unilateral attempts to alter group outcomes, in which no effort is made to provide other group members with a rationale for one's position. These assertions may be blunt, directive, and relatively coercive in the sense that no effort is made to obtain compliance "voluntarily." They tend to be short, choppy phrases

[1] The full MPACS package is available from the author on request.

like "That was stupid;" "No, he didn't;" "Don't do that;" or "I put that it was the husband."

Included in this broad category are seven specific behaviors. Rejecting/attacking involves direct negative statements which are personally critical, and usually given in angry or ridiculing tones. I count them as the most extreme power modes represented in this system, as they are instances of verbal aggression, or verbal expressions intended to injure the other (Foss, 1979). Physical aggression - the ultimate power mode particularly of men (Goode, 1971) - is left out when one is confined to the laboratory. However, including even the milder verbal aggression for study allows some important tie-ins with the rapidly expanding literature on domestic violence.

The command code is the only one in the system defined solely in terms of formal grammatical structure. Any statement which is a formal command or directive is included. Do anyway attempts are especially interesting. In the IMC context, this is usually a case where one partner goes ahead and writes in her own response on the joint answer form, against the objections of the other. It may be the prototype of all unqualified power assertions - and not surprisingly was often responded to with verbal aggression. This was not a frequently used code in the laboratory, although one would expect it to be more frequent and important in its impact at home.

Surrender under protest is a rather unusual code developed in the process of listening to the tapes. This is a one-sided capitulation in which the message is really not "I give in," but

almost the opposite. These "surrenders" are a final attempt to either "guilt-trip" or threaten the other for his own browbeating behavior. In fact, this behavior occurs when the actor thinks the other is being coercive. It is a giving notice of withdrawal or attack if the coerciveness continues. There is usually either hostility or exaggerated indifference in the voice.

Surrender in protest is a special kind of withdrawal. A laboratory task does not allow the two partners to withdraw as much or offer the same variety of withdrawal forms an can be used on the home. Thus, this kind of behavior was relatively infrequent in this research. However, as a strategy in confrontation processes, withdrawal is probably very important for married couples in everyday life (Foss, 1979).

The last three codes in this division are parallel to one another, and each is common enough to be very important in the overall system. Reiteration is flat repetition of one's position. Unqualified disagreement/refusal includes flat disagreements like "No, I won't;" and "It didn't say that." Unqualified partisan assertions are flat statements of position like "I had the wife on mine." All are unelaborated statements in which the actor is making no effort to persuade or qualify or obtain voluntary compliance or agreement.

Qualified Power Assertions

Like the unqualified power assertions, qualified power assertions are unilateral in the sense that the communication is one-sided. The actor is operating with a view toward the other person - not himself - changing. However, here the actor

is offering some inducement or incentive for the other to alter behavior. There are three subtypes of QPA which represent different degrees of subtlety in the inducements for change which are offered. All are still attempts to obtain "voluntary" compliance.

Consequence Identification. The most direct kind of QPA is consequence identification, in which the actor explicitly promises rewards or threatens punishments in exchange for behavioral change. These are very clear statements of the form "if you do..., then I will...." Promises are offers of rewards for desired behaviors, and threats are statements of the retaliation or punishment which will result from undesired behavior. The reward or punishment may be either material or expressive. It seems important to keep threats and promises separate, since there are strong indications that rewarding and punishing behavior have very different consequences (see for example, Foa and Foa, 1975; French and Raven, 1959; Raven et al., 1975; Skinner, 1951).

In this research, there were no instances of promises and only five instances of threats among all the couples. These behaviors are the most explicit out-croppings of underlying relational structures based on exchange, and it is not entirely legitimate for family members to behave in ways which recognize that basis for their relationships.

I would expect the frequency of these behaviors to be even lower in the laboratory than in a natural setting, if only because the cues for the full range of exchange items available at home are not available in the laboratory. On is likely to think only

of offering or threatening emotional and positional items. In addition to the lack of cues for other items, there may be a tendency to offer or threaten a response "in kind" to the one one wishes to induce or change (Foa and Foa, 1975:8). For both these reasons, in the laboratory one might hear "If you keep being so stubborn, I'll really be angry" (a threat of expressive retaliation in exchange for a certain kind of expressive behavior), but one would be less likely to hear "If you keep being so stubborn, I won't go to the movies tonight" (there are no cues in the lab suggesting that the movies are relevant, and the two behaviors are highly dissimilar).

I would also expect threats to far outnumber promises in the home setting, if only because explicit exchanges may not be considered very legitimate in families, and by the time one is making them one may well be angry or frustrated. The area in which promises are most likely to occur is in the division of household tasks, and one would expect this to be more common among couples who are breaking out of traditional family roles.

Qualified Partisan Assertion. The second type of QPA, qualified partisan assertions, are elaborated statements of one's own position, where there is an attempt to persuade or convince the other. They are persuasive arguments based on logic, analogies, hypothetical appeals, and appeals for empathy. The actor is not just stating a position, but providing a rationale for it. The partner is being offered some "good reason" for compliance.

Definitional Assertion. These are the most subtle QPA's, and perhaps the most difficult to justify as power assertions.

Here the actor is presenting his definition of some aspect of the situation, and thus laying the groundwork for behavior change by the other. If one actor can get the other to accept his view of the "facts of the case," he is closer to obtaining a position change. Further, if the partner does change her position, she has been given an opportunity to rationalize the change as a function of a new understanding of "the facts," rather than giving in or losing the argument.

In justifying the inclusion of definitional assertions as power assertions, it must be remembered that what is "information" at all in a given interaction sequence is questionable. The speaker may be elaborating, distorting, attributing meaning or motives, making generalizations, or drawing conclusions. As the IMC task itself models, two persons' perceptions of the "facts" may be quite different. Thus, whose version is adopted for group use is an important determinant of group outcomes.

The control of information has been recognized as important in this regard (French and Raven, 1959; Raven et al, 1975; Smith, 1970). Indeed the access to information which seems relevant to the resource domain, and the actual control of information relevant to the power outcomes domain, seem to have a natural parallel in attempts to control information in the power processes domain.

There are five types of definitional assertion identified in MPACS. Task/procedure definitions refer to the nature of the task itself and how it can be done ("We have to finish this one first. We're supposed to go in order."). Situation definitions

are attempts to supply the facts of the case (in this research, mainly what went on in the vignettes) ("This is the one where the wife didn't get the car fixed like she said she would."). Personal definitions are characterizations of self, spouse, their relationship, friends, or relatives ("We never argue over such silly details." or "Your parents do exactly the same thing.").

Other's position definition is an attempt to define or feedback to the other his own position. Ostensibly this is just a helpful checking out procedure, but it can also be used to "lead" the other or make his position look absurd, simplistic, or ridiculous ("As I understand you, the husband really laid into her about the spark plugs." or "I'm sure you would say she accepted the responsibility." (slightly sarcastic)). Finally, progress definition is a summary statement as to the couple's progress on the task, or a laying out of alternative courses of action and approaches. Generally, it provides a broader perspective on the discussion itself ("This is going nowhere. We really seem to disagree on this one.").

Bilateral Power Assertions

These are explicit suggestions or offers for both partners to partially change their positions simultaneously. The expectation is that partial concessions will be reciprocated. Thus, both actors win something and lose something, and neither totally experiences either the "thrill of victory" or the "agony of defeat." This behavior involves making contracts, bargaining, negotiating, or trading.

The most direct BPA is an explicit position trade. In the context of the IMC task, this means offering to give in on one of the choices so you can have your way on the other: "I'll agree on blaming Steve, if you'll say the wife on the second part." This is actually an eminently logical and appropriate solution to the vignettes. To use the car repair case as an example, it is perfectly sensible to suggest that Steve should be seen as more responsible for the problem, since he became inappropriately irate in response to a small error, while suggesting that Linda should change her behavior by following through on responsibilities once accepted. Or, one could say that Linda is primarily responsible for the problem since she failed to get the car properly repaired, but that Steve over-reacted and is being unreasonable in his response.

Another explicit trade, which can occur on other than IMC tasks, is to exchange one item for another, as in "I'll give you this one, if we can go back and change the last one."

Other compromise/bilateral solution includes any explicit offer of trade other than direct trade-offs of position. One possibility is to suggest compromising in a broad way. Another is to "agree to disagree" and just pick choices out of expediency. Another is to suggest an arbitrary or external decision rule such as flipping a coin, or alternating "wins." Finally, one can invoke a decision rule based on expertise.

The most startling thing about the bilateral power assertions is their infrequency. The low number of bilateral power assertions used by the couples, as well as the low number of compromise

outcomes actually produced by them (an average of 1.9 per couple), is relevant to Sprey's (1972; 1975) argument that families are not analogous to zero-sum games. The findings in this research are reminders that even if structurally a situation is not zero-sum (and that is itself questionable with regard to families), it is possible for group members to treat the situation as if it is zero-sum in nature. Thus, we must take care not to substitute a new assumption about families - that they are not zero-sum in nature - for the old, equally faulty one that they are.

Miscellaneous Codes

Self-depreciation/deference is not a power assertion, but was coded as a parallel to reject/attack other. This code seemed theoretically interesting in that submissive, victim-like behavior has been seen as inviting attack (Gelles, 1972:155-6). However, little of this sort of behavior was actually engaged in by the couples studied.

All other statements not covered by the MPACS categories were simply tallied as non-power assertions. Many of these were statements of agreement, support, or conceding to the other.

BASIC MPACS FINDINGS: HUSBANDS AND WIVES

To gain a sense of how the MPACS system "works," it is useful to examine some basic findings using the system. For this purpose, Table 3 gives the mean scores of the husbands and wives in the sample, as well as the difference between the scores for the two groups. This discussion can actually be seen as a preliminary analysis of the validity of the coding system, since determining

whether the system produces findings which are expected helps to establish validity.[1]

Previous Research on Sex Differences in Communication

One of the problems with research on sex differences in communication is that there tends to be an overly defensive approach to women's communication patterns. The focus is often one which ignores the strengths of female communication, and instead seeks to rather apologetically explain why women aren't more like men (Thorne and Henley, 1975).

Another difficulty with sex differences research, however, is that it overemphasizes the differences, and thus gives a vastly inaccurate underestimate of the extent to which human communication is the same, whether produced by women or men. In line with this, when we seek differences between men and women, we tend to overlook the extent to which the findings of sex difference are highly mixed and inconsistent (Thorne, 1978).

[1] Another means of assessing validity is to examine the internal correlation matrixes for the MPACS categories, for the husbands and wives respectively. One should find that codes which are clustered together for conceptual reasons - such as the definitional assertions - do in fact correlate with one another, and generally more highly than with other categories. Complete information on this may be obtained from the author. Briefly, and generally speaking, the system does seem adequate in this respect. For example, rejecting/attacking is most highly correlated with three codes from its own group (UPA's) - command, reiteration, and unqualified disagreement. This holds for both men and women.

Particular codes should also be highly related to other theoretically linked categories, and not related to those which are theoretically unconnected. For example, reject/attack should show little relationship to the BPA codes, and for both men and women, there were no relationships between these variables. The MPACS package does not meet these criteria without exception, and it works somewhat differently for men and women. However, in general the codes seem to cluster empirically, and there are no glaring anomalies.

Nonetheless, when studies do show sex differences in language, they suggest that women use a "weaker," more hesitant style. In reviewing research on communication, Walum concludes that women's speech suggests "someone who lacks confidence, is uncertain of her own feelings, seeks approval from others, cannot make up her mind, and lacks an opinion of her own" (1977:29). In contrast, men are required to indicate "seriousness of purpose, hard hittingness, and decisiveness, whether they feel that way or not," and it is difficult for them to express any feeling except anger (1977:30).

In another analysis of male/female speech, the conclusion is that:

> 1. Women's speech tends to be more person-centered and concerned with interpersonal matters. It is apt to deal with the speaker's own and other's feelings. It is more polite, more indirect, and uses the method of implication. It employes qualifiers and other softening devices to avoid imposing belief, agreement, or obedience on others through overly strong statements, questions, or commands.
>
> 2. Men's speech tends to be more centered around external things and is more apt to involve straight factual communication. It is more literal, direct, and to the point. It employs stronger statements and forms that tend to press compliance, agreement, or belief on the listener (Eakins and Eakins, 1978:49).

Given these previous research findings, one may hypothesize that in the NPACS system:

> 1. Men will use the more direct UPA's in general more often than women. Men will in particular use the command behavior more often. Men will also use the task and situation definition categories more often.
>
> 2. Women are expected to use the qualified partisan assertions more than men. They will use personal and other's position definitions more, as well as self-depreciation more than men.

Looking at the mean scores in Table 3, it is clear that women do use qualified partisan assertions more than men. They also were more likely to use personal definition, but not other's position definition (a rare behavior for both groups) than men. Self-depreciating behavior was also rare in this research, but women did behave this way more than men, as expected.

As predicted, men used all the UPS's somewhat more frequently than women, except for reject/attack. Women had a slight edge there. In addition, men more often defined the task, although there was little difference in situation definition behavior. Finally, men were somewhat more likely to make bilateral power assertions than the women in this study.

Thus, while the differences in the table are relatively small in many cases, they are almost all in the expected direction. This degree of consistency in meeting expectations clearly warrants attention.

Perhaps the most significant finding in the table, however, is that there are only small differences between the men and women in how frequently they exhibit each behavior. This may well underscore Thorne's caution not to over-emphasize the differences in men's and women's communication.

One other possibiloty that cannot be overlooked, though, is that the laboratory task may induce an artificially high degree of similarity in behavior. One, in a two-person task it is difficult for one person to engage in much less sheer behavior than the other. In this research, the mean total number of coded behaviors for the men was 110.65, and 108.78

for the women, showing little difference. Thus, there seems to be a conversation-based limit to how discrepant the behaviors can be.

This does not explain why there is such consistency category by category. A second consideration is that the formal nature of the task and the even-handed treatment of the partners in the instructions and by the session administrator, gave many of the women clear permission to operate on an equal footing with their spouses. That is a permission that many women would not have in their more informal, private encounters with men, and without which they would not be as active and direct. If there is a laboratory/natural setting discrepancy here, then, it is in the direction of women being more like men than they would be in everyday life. On the other side of the coin, the task may also induce the husbands to be more like their wives than they would be in a natural setting, in that it asks for a full consideration of marital difficulties, feelings, and perspectives which many men would not ordinarily see as necessary to discuss, or as issues they are willing or able to discuss.

CONCLUSION

This paper presented a new system for coding marital interaction in the laboratory, MPACS, and provides some preliminary findings on the use of the system with a sample of 78 married couples engaged in the Inventory of Marital Conflicts task. I have argued that the incorporation of the notion of power modes into a model of power, and the development of means of

measuring the concept, can lead to a more complete understanding of marital power relations, and ultimately to a more dynamic, process-oriented approach to confrontation and change in marriage.

The sample selection procedures and sample characteristics suggest that much caution must be used in making generalizations from this application of the MPACS. While the social characteristics of the couples are fairly broad, this is basically a middle class, professional sample, with the clinical couples included making for greater range in the sample than would otherwise be found. The actual results reported here may be seen as a try-out for the coding system, and as a basis for further hypothesis-development and research.

The focus of the research on interaction in the laboratory over a researcher-defined task is both a limitation and a strength. There is a degree of control over "extraneous" varibales which is clearly an advantage. Yet, obviously the setting precludes investigating some important aspects of marital power processes in natural settings. Some of the likely differences have been discussed throughout the paper.

While the findings reported here may be seen as a trial run of MPACS, they are overall a successful trial. The coding system divides power assertions into three types - unqualified, qualified, and bilateral - and systematically identifies sub-types within each division. It appears to provide a typology of power modes which makes sense conceptually, and for which some evidence of empirical validity can be established. For example, when the power modes of wives and husbands were examined, the findings

were consistent with hypotheses drawn from previous research on sex differences in communication. Women tended to use a more qualified, person-centered, and sometimes self-depreciating approach, while men tended to be more direct, to make more task and situation definitions, and to use bilateral assertions more than the women.

Finally, a major strength of the overall research from which this paper is drawn is the multi-method, multi-person approach. Self-reports on several aspects of power, observation of laboratory interaction, and measures of task outcomes are available for both wives and husbands. This still uncommon combination of methods and viewpoints can yield special insight into marital power relations. Future reports will concentrate on relationships between the MPACS initially described here, and other dimensions of power.

Table 1. Selected Statistics for Wives' Power Mode Scores, based on the Marital Power Assertion Coding System (MPACS).

Power Mode	Mean	% of Total	Median	Range	Standard Deviation	Skewness	Kurtosis
Unqualified Power Assertions							
Reject/attack	2.08	1.9	.91	0-23	3.61	3.44	14.69
Command	1.88	1.7	.75	0-18	2.92	2.85	11.25
"Do anyway"	.12	-	.05	0-3	.43	4.68	25.41
Surrender in protest	.64	-	.28	0-5	1.10	1.93	3.28
Reiteration	10.74	9.9	7.5	0-69	10.96	2.51	9.35
Unqualified disagreement	4.38	4.0	3.2	0-24	4.46	1.76	4.19
Unqualified partisan assertion	16.42	15.1	14.9	5-60	8.40	2.24	8.26
Qualified Power Assertions							
Consequence identification[1]	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Qualified partisan assertion	18.29	16.8	15.5	1-53	10.28	.90	.93
Definitional assertion							
Task definition	4.96	4.6	4.0	0-18	4.15	1.13	.91
Situation definition	17.58	16.2	17.39	2-60	9.34	1.22	4.25
Personal definition	7.88	7.2	5.90	0-39	7.28	1.76	3.73
Other's position definition	1.78	1.6	1.00	0-12	2.33	1.97	4.47
Progress definition	1.91	1.7	1.55	0-17	2.40	3.60	19.20
Bilateral Power Assertions							
Explicit position trade	.08	-	.03	0-3	.39	6.07	39.88
Other bilateral solution	.18	-	.08	0-4	.56	4.66	27.00
Other							
Self-depreciation	.86	-	.36	0-6	1.32	1.83	3.12
Non-power assertion	19.00	17.5	17.67	2-62	10.90	1.17	2.03

[1]Of the two types, threats and promises, one wife used threats twice.

Table 2. Selected Statistics for Husbands' Power Modes Scores, based on the Marital Power Assertion Coding System (MPACS).

Power Mode	Mean	% of Total	Median	Range	Standard Deviation	Skewness	Kurtosis
Unqualified Power Assertions							
Reject/attack	1.88	1.6	1.0	0-11	2.60	1.93	3.56
Command	2.38	2.1	1.62	0-11	2.58	1.60	2.52
"Do anyway"	.30	-	.10	0-5	.82	3.53	14.46
Surrender in protest	.76	-	.26	0-6	1.34	1.96	3.44
Reiteration	11.63	10.5	8.10	0-83	12.82	2.95	11.69
Unqualified disagreement	4.88	4.4	3.36	0-23	4.96	1.49	2.18
Unqualified partisan assertion	18.01	17.2	17.75	3-62	8.60	1.76	7.53
Qualified Power Assertions							
Consequence identification[1]	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Qualified partisan assertion	16.42	14.8	16.50	0-37	8.54	.26	-.47
Definitional assertion							
Task definition	5.49	5.0	4.83	0-30	4.75	2.24	8.24
Situation definition	17.71	16.0	16.75	1-54	9.18	1.04	2.46
Personal definition	7.16	6.5	5.50	0-26	5.76	1.16	.77
Other's position definition	1.72	1.5	1.18	0-9	1.92	1.43	2.10
Progress definition	1.91	1.7	1.44	0-12	2.39	2.39	6.52
Bilateral Power Assertions							
Explicit position trade	.22	-	.08	0-3	.62	3.12	9.61
Other bilateral solution	.43	-	.19	0-3	.82	1.95	2.94
Other							
Self-depreciation	.58	-	.22	0-7	1.22	2.99	10.17
Non-power assertion	19.17	17.3	17.83	2-50	10.20	.82	.57

[1]Of the two types, threats and promises, three husbands used threats once each.

Table 3. Comparison of Mean Power Modes Scores of Husbands and Wives (N=76)

Power Mode	Mean		Difference between means*
	Husbands	Wives	
Unqualified Power Assertions			
Reject/attack	1.88	2.08	- .20
Command	2.38	1.88	+ .50
"Do anyway"	.30	.12	+ .18
Surrender in protest	.76	.64	+ .12
Reiteration	11.63	10.74	+ .89
Unqualified disagreement	4.88	4.38	+ .50
Unqualified partisan assertion	18.01	16.42	+1.59
Qualified Power Assertions			
Consequence Identification	--	--	--
Qualified partisan assertion	16.42	18.29	-1.87
Definitional assertion			
Task definition	5.49	4.96	+ .53
Situation definition	17.71	17.58	+ .13
Personal definition	7.16	7.88	- .72
Other's position definition	1.72	1.78	- .05
Progress definition	1.91	1.91	--
Bilateral Power Assertions			
Explicit position trade	.22	.08	+ .14
Other bilateral solution	.43	.18	+ .25
Other			
Self-depreciation	.58	.86	- .28
Non-power assertion	19.17	19.00	+ .17

*A "+" means the husbands' scores are higher, and a "-" means the wives' scores are higher.

REFERENCES

Bahr, Stephen J.
1972 "Comment on 'The study of family power structure: a review 1960-1969.'" Journal of Marriage and the Family (May):239.

Bales, R. F.
1950 Interaction Process Analysis: A Method for the Study of Small Groups. Cambridge, Mass.: Addison-Wesley.

Blood, R. O., Jr., and D. M. Wolfe
1960 Husbands and Wives: The Dynamics of Married Living. Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press.

Broderick, Carlfred B.
1975 "Power in the governance of families." pp. 117-128 in R. E. Cromwell and D. H. Olson (Eds.), Power in Families. New York: Halsted Press.

Buckley, Walter, And Tom R. Burns
1975 "Relational control and meta-power." Mimeo.

Burr, Wesley R.
1973 Theory Construction and the Sociology of the Family. New York: John Wiley.

Caputo, D. V.
1963 "The parents of the schizophrenic." Family Process 2:339-356.

Cromwell, Ronald E., and David H. Olson
1975 "Multidisciplinary perspectives of power." pp. 15-37 in R. E. Cromwell and D. H. Olson (Eds.), Power in Families. New York: Halsted Press.

Cromwell, Ronald E., David M. Klein, and Stephen G. Weiting
1975 "Family power: a multitrait-multimethod analysis: pp. 151-181 in R. E. Cromwell and D. H. Olson (Eds.), Power in Families. New York: Halsted Press.

Eakins, Barbara Westbrook, and R. Gene Eakins
1978 Sex Differences in Human Communication. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Farina, A.
1960 "Patterns of role dominance and conflict in parents of schizophrenic patients." Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology 61:31-33.

Foa, Urile G. and Edna B. Foa
1975 "Resource theory of social exchange." Modular Studies Series. Morristown, New Jersey: General Learning Press.

Foss, Joyce E.
1978 Types of Power Assertion and the Distribution of Power in Marriage. Ph.D. Dissertation. University of New Hampshire.

1979 "The paradoxical nature of family relationships and family conflict." Chapter 8 in M. A. Straus and G. T. Hotaling (Eds.), The Social Causes of Husband-Wife Violence. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press (in press).

Foss, Joyce E., and Murray A. Straus
1975 "Family power measures: an inventory and conceptual analysis." Unpublished paper.

French, John R. P., Jr., and Bertram Raven
1959 "The bases of social power." pp. 259-269 in D. Cartwright (Ed.), Studies in Social Power. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Gelles, Richard J.
1972 The Violent Home. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Goode, William J.
1971 "Force and violence in the family." Journal of Marriage and the Family 33 (November):624-636.

Hawley, A.
1963 "Community power and urban renewal success." American Journal of Sociology 68:422-431.

Hoffman, M. L.
1963 "Parent discipline and the child's consideration for others." Child Development 34:573-587.

1970 "Moral development." pp. 261-359 in P. H. Mussen (Ed.) Carmichael's Manual of Child Psychology, Vol. II (3rd ed.) New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

Kenkel, W. F.
1963 "Observational studies of husband-wife interaction in family decision making." Pp. 144-156 in M.B. Sussman (Ed.), Sourcebook in Marriage and the Family. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.

Leighton, L. A., G. E. Stollack, and L. R. Fergusson
1971 "Patterns of communication in normal and clinic families." Journal of Counseling and Clinical Psychology 36:252-256.

Olson, David H.
1969 "The measurement of family power by self-report and behavioral methods." Journal of Marriage and the Family 31:545-550.

Olson, David H., and Ronald E. Cromwell
1975 "Power in families." pp. 3-11 in R. E. Cromwell and D. H. Olson (Eds.), Power in Families. New York: Halsted Press.

1975 "Methodological issues in family power." pp. 131-150 in R. E. Cromwell and D. H. Olson (Eds.), Power in Families. New York: Halsted Press.

Olson, David H., and Carolyn Rabunsky
1972 "Validity of four measures of family power." Journal of Marriage and the Family (May):225-233.

Olson, David H., and R. G. Ryder
1970 "Inventory of Marital Conflicts (IMC): an experimental interaction procedure." Journal of Marriage and the Family 32:443-448.

1973 "IFC coding system." Mimeo (May).

Raven, Bertram H., Richard Centers, and Aroldo Rodrigues
1975 "The bases of conjugal power." pp. 217-232 in R. E. Cromwell and D. H. Olson (Eds.), Power in Families. New York: Halsted Press.

Riskin, and Faunce
1970 "Family interaction scales, I. Theoretical framework and method." Archives of General Psychiatry 22:527-37.

Rogers, Mary F.
1974 "Instrumental and infra-resources: the bases of power." American Journal of Sociology 79 (6):1418-1433.

Safilios-Rothschild, Constantina
1969 "Patterns of familial power and influence." Sociological Focus 2:7-19.

1970 "The study of family power structure: a review 1960-1969." Journal of Marriage and the Family 32:539-552.

Smith, Thomas Ewin
1970 "Foundations of parental influence upon adolescents: an application of social power theory." American Sociological Review 35 (5):860-873.

Skinner, B. F.
1953 Science and Human Behavior. New York: Macmillan.

Sprey, Jetse
1972 "Family power structure: a critical comment." Journal of Marriage and the Family (May):235-238.

1975 "Family power and process: toward a conceptual integration." Pp. 61-79 in R. E. Cromwell and D. H. Olson (Eds.), Power in Families. New York: Halsted Press.

Straus, Murray A.
1974 "Leveling, civility, and violence in the family." Journal of Marriage and the Family 36 (February): 13-29.

Straus, Murray A. and Irving Tallman
1971 "SIMFAM: A technique for observational measurement and experimental study of families." Pp. 384-438 in Joan Aldous et al. (Eds.), Family Problem Solving. Hinsdale, Ill.: Dryden Press.

Strodtbeck, F. L.
1951 "Husband-wife interaction over revealed differences." American Journal of Sociology 16:468-473.

1954 "The family as a three-person group." American Sociological Review 19:23-29.

Thorne, Barrie
1978 "Sex and language." Paper presented at the Feminist Scholarship Conference, University of Illinois, Champaign-Urbana.

Thorne, Barrie, and Nancy Henley
1975 "Difference and dominance: an overview of language, gender, and society," in B. Thorne and N. Henley (Eds.), Language and Sex: Difference and Dominance. Rowley, Mass.: Newburg House.

Turk, J. L.
1974 "Power as the achievement of ends: a problematic approach in family and small group research." Family Process 13 (1):39-52.

1975 "Uses and abuses of family power." pp. 80-94 in R. E. Cromwell and D. H. Olson (Eds.), Power in Families. New York: Halsted Press.

Turk, James L., and Norman W. Bell
1972 "Measuring power in families." Journal of Marriage and the Family (May):215-222.

Walum, Laurel Richardson
1977 The Dynamics of Sex and Gender. Chicago: Rand McNally College Publishing Company.